



PALOLO NEIGHBORHOOD BOARD NO. 6

c/o NEIGHBORHOOD COMMISSION • 530 SOUTH KING STREET, ROOM 400 • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813

PHONE: (808) 527-5749 • FAX: (808) 527-5760 • INTERNET: www.co.honolulu.hi.us

PUBLIC UTILITIES
COMMISSION

OCT 7 2 20 PM '04

FILED

October 4, 2004

Public Utilities Commission
465 South King Street
Kekuanaoa Building, Room 103
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Re: **Hawaiian Electric Company's Proposed East Oahu Transmission Project (EOTP) - 46kV Line**

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing on behalf of Palolo Neighborhood Board No. 6 to urge the Public Utilities Commission to ensure that the Hawaiian Electric Company's proposed Kamoku-Pukele 138,000 volt transmission line is not considered as an option. As reflected in the three resolutions adopted on July 28, 1993, February 22, 1995 and September 23, 1998, for years, the Palolo Neighborhood Board has consistently opposed the Kamoku-Pukele line constructed in Palolo Valley -- on the ground that HECO has never established the need for the project. In light of new energy generation and transmission technologies, the Palolo Neighborhood Board is more convinced now than ever that there is simply no need for the Kamoku-Pukele line.

The Consumer Advocate appears to be analyzing whether the Palolo underground route is the best option. The Palolo route is part of the Kamoku-Pukele EIS, which is an exhibit in the EOTP docket. The Palolo Neighborhood Board does not want the line in Palolo Valley.

Please answer the following questions:

1. Can the Pukele Substation be expanded, and if so, by how much? Will HECO have to do another EIS if the Palolo Underground route is chosen?
2. Is the Underground route through Palolo Valley still a route under consideration?
3. Has HECO evaluated any other technology or routes for Palolo?
4. Is the Palolo alignment as denoted in the EOTP Exhibit 4, a reasonable alternative?
5. Should all Palolo alignments have the degree of analysis devoted to the EOTP alternatives?
6. Has there been any cultural impact analysis in the vicinity of the Pukele Substation?
7. Are there historical agricultural terraces along the Palolo alignments?
8. Are there any historic heiau along the Palolo alignments?



9. Doesn't a more detailed analysis need to be included if you go with the Palolo alignment?
10. Has the Carlos Long Neighborhood been analyzed for historical and/or burial sites?
11. Has HECO done additional EMF readings at Pukele? What were the results?
12. Why have there been so many helicopters used by HECO in repairing transmission lines near Palolo?
13. What questions did the Consumer Advocate ask regarding the Palolo route? AND what answers did you give to the Consumer Advocate?
14. Who did you consult with about cultural impacts in Palolo Valley?

In considering HECO's Draft Environmental Assessment, the Public Utilities Commission must balance the costs and benefits of the project to determine whether approving or denying the Environmental Assessment will best serve the public interest. Please consider the interest of the people of Palolo Valley and not allow any additional electric lines through the valley.

Thank you very much for your consideration of the Palolo Neighborhood Board's views. Please feel free to contact me at 392-1136, if you would like to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,

Darlene H. Nakayama

MR for
Darlene H. Nakayama
Chairperson

PUBLIC UTILITIES
COMMISSION

OCT 7 2 20 PM '04

FILED